DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 223 697 TM 820 844

AUTHOR Hill, Deborah
TITLE A Content Analysis of Special Education Teacher Evaluation Forms.
PUB DATE Aug 82
NOTE 71p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Dissertations/Theses - Master Theses (042)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrators; Adults; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Criteria; Records (Forms); Special Education; *Special Education Teachers; *Standards; *Teacher Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS Illinois

ABSTRACT

The presence of selected standards and criteria found within special education teacher evaluation forms was investigated. In 1979, directors of special education districts, assistants to the directors, and directors of joint agreements were requested to send a copy of the teacher evaluation form most commonly used in their schools. In 1982, the same sample was again asked to send their teacher evaluation forms. Each form (n=132) was scored on seven standards: (1) discipline, (2) behavior management, (3) classroom management, (4) instructional, (5) relationships with parents, (6) professional development, and (7) communication between special education and local district. A mean was derived for each criterion statement for each standard. The seven selected standards did not demonstrate a statistically significant difference between teacher evaluation forms of 1979 and 1982. Examination of a specific criterion within each standard did demonstrate growth in the stated criterion between 1979 and 1982. The increase in the number of rankings for a selected criterion did indicate compliance with state and federal mandates with special education. Decreases in specific criteria were resultant of administrative/managerial perceived needs, and not resultant of improved special education teacher effectiveness. (Author/PN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED223697

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

A CONTENT ANALYSIS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER EVALUATION FORMS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
D. Hill
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by

Deborah Hill

B.S., Southern Illinois University, 1975

A Research Report Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Science

Department of Special Education
in the Graduate School
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
August, 1982

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

Carbondale, Illinois

Date July 19, 1982

TO THE GRADUATE DEAN:

I recommend that the paper by Deborah Hill

titled A Content Analysis of Special Education Teacher Evaluation Forms

be accepted by the Graduate School as evidence of research competence on the part of one seeking the master's degree.

I understand that this paper is being submitted as proof of a capacity for research and its reporting.

In Charge of Research Paper

Head of Department

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the following persons for their unending support; Dr. Howard Morgan, Dr. Russell Wright, Minnie Minnito, the Hill family, staff at McKinley school, and Russell, Roxanne, Lisa and Clifford, for their "sticky fingers" with envelopes and stamps. A special "thank you" to Dr. Stoneburner and Dr. Teska for supporting my theory of the differences between a special education teacher and a professor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ii

LIST OF TABLES iv

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Problem Statement 4
Research Questions 6
Definition of Terms 6

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE 8

III. METHODOLOGY 26

Subjects 26
Instrumentation 26
Method 28
Analysis of Results 29

IV. RESULTS 30

Data Summary 36

V. DISCUSSION 37

Summary of Results 44
Implications 45
Limitations of the Research 46

REFERENCES 48

APPENDIX A 52

APPENDIX B 55

APPENDIX C 56

APPENDIX D 57

VITA 59

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	1979 Specific Criterion Totals and Means	31
2.	1982 Specific Criterion Totals and Means	33
3.	1979; 1982 Total Criterion Standard Rank, Means, and *t* Values	36

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the presence of selected standards and criteria found within special education teacher evaluation forms. The standards to be investigated are: discipline, behavior management, classroom management, instructional, parent relationships, professional development, and communication between the local district and the special education district (Ehrenberg & Brandt, 1976; The School Code of Illinois, 1979; Vergason & Brandt, 1979).

Local schools are hosts to the special education classrooms, which are grouped within a building, or within a self-contained program and evaluation is disseminated from the special education district's office, to a special education supervisor, to the building principal. As special education teachers become more involved in the evaluative process, teachers find that evaluation is as vital as the salary schedule, retirement benefits, insurance programs, or other conditions for employment (Klahn, 1965).

Teachers, as professionals, have been forced to accept a new rhetoric, 'accountability' of the education profession. Teachers must accept the sometimes distasteful, but most essential, task of policing their own profession. To police the profession effectively, teachers must first have input into the development of criteria of

satisfactory professional performance, arrive at a consensus, and then apply the chosen criteria. As teachers assume this task through in-service, appraisal, or workshops, the criteria established becomes the 'accountability' factor which is generally agreed upon for those teachers.

For the special educator, selection and utilization of chosen criteria poses a unique problem. The special educator must account for district philosophies, personal philosophies, and the local or host school policies. The selection of the criteria for measuring teacher effectiveness could be the most difficult and most important task in developing a teacher evaluation form (Marks, 1976). The trend of merging special education classrooms within a host school provides direct input to teacher evaluation. The teacher will be scheduled for periodic, regular evaluation, which will delineate further the evaluative differences between regular and special education evaluation procedures. It can be concluded that these evaluative differences could appear on the actual special education teacher evaluation form.

Special education evaluative procedures historically have been solely the responsibility of the special education districts moving their programs, teachers, and children back to the public school, special education is not the isolated profession of the past. The philosophies, students, teachers, supervisors, and the administrators have moved to the 'battleground.' Regular education and special education, by law, now assume a combined effort to improve

instruction (The Federal Register, August 23, 1977).

The functions and purposes of regular and special education is to improve instruction. To complicate the purposes of evaluation, there are no standards which are commonly agreed upon as the criteria for teacher effectiveness (Mitzel, 1960). Regular and special educator's share this dilemma in the evaluative process. Purposes of evaluation have been described by Stinnett and Huggett (1968):

> pupil progress, methods of teaching, relationships with school and community, the teacher's growth, test of teacher's stability, and a composite plan for evaluation (pp. 174-75).

Bolton (1973) describes the purposes of evaluation as:

> improving instruction, rewarding superior performance, modification of assignment, protection of the individual and organization, validation of the selection process, and promotion of individual growth and self-evaluation (pp. 98-102).

The wide disparity of determining purposes, the lack of standards, and the lack of valid criteria, remain as problems for educators. The state rules and regulations and federal statutes that govern special education can be reflected within a special educator's teacher evaluation form or appraisal process (The Federal Register, August 23, 1977; Illinois Rules and Regulations to Govern the Administration and Operation of Special Education, 1979; The School Code of Illinois, 1979). It is evident that evaluative differences do exist, and these differences could be reflected within the form even if the classroom is located within a host school. It is also evident that standards do exist if state and federal law is adhered to and

their interpretations carry through to the reason for the laws, 'the special education population.'

Problem Statement

Before teacher evaluation of a special educator can have significance for educational research, standards must be reliable. It is this researcher's intent to demonstrate that select standards do exist in the State of Illinois for special education. The reliability of these standards can be demonstrated through the consistent appearance on the actual teacher evaluation form most commonly used in its application with special educators. It also is this researcher's intent to demonstrate that quantitative differences exist in the appearance of selected criteria between 1979 and 1982.

The following standards and specific criteria have been selected by this researcher:

Discipline

- adequate control of classroom
- defined classroom procedures/rules/schedules
- provides for reinforcement as well as punishment (Gallup, 1981; Gargiulo & Pigge, 1979; The School Code of Illinois, 1979).

Behavior Management

- develops written behavioral management objectives as needed/planning
- implementation consistent with behavior management objectives/delivery
- student's progress is recorded/assessment
- develops/implements effective behavior management strategies/implementation (Gargiulo & Pigge, 1979; Illinois Rules and Regulations to Govern the Administration and Operation of Special Education, 1979).

Classroom Management

- positive emotional climate
- classroom management techniques
- recognition of student achievement
- teacher response appropriate to appropriate behavior
  (Christner, 1979; Gargiulo & Pigge, 1979; Thomas, 1974; Westling, Koorland, & Rose, 1981).

Instructional

- daily lesson plans
- Individualized Education Program (IEP) development/management
- provides individualized instruction/methods/materials
- evaluation and recording of student progress
  (Illinois Rules and Regulations to Govern the Administration and Operation of Special Education, 1979).

Relationships with Parents

- respects confidentiality of student/parent
- follows procedures for parent involvement in IEP process
- maintains verbal/written contacts with parents
- records verbal/written contacts with parents
- informs administration of parent concerns
  (The Federal Register, August 2[illegible], 1977).

Professional Development

- promotes positive attitude towards special education
- engages in activities, readings, study, to maintain professional expertise in area
- attends/supervises in-service programs/workshops
- effective communication with support personnel
- effective communication with local district/cooperative relationships
- community and public relations
  (King, 1978; Rubin, 1975; The School Code of Illinois, 1979; Westling, et al., 1981).

Communication Between Special Education District and Local District

- observes host school rules and regulations
- uses proper channels of communication
- incorporates policies/philosophies in conjunction with special education district
- demonstrates knowledge and utilization of local district and special education curriculum
  (Sapone, 1981; The School Code of Illinois, 1979; Westling, et al., 1981).

Research Questions

1. Will the presence of the standard, discipline, demonstrate a significant difference between 1979 and 1982?

2. Will the presence of the standard, behavior management, demonstrate a significant difference between 1979 and 1982?

3. Will the presence of the standard, classroom management, demonstrate a significant difference between 1979 and 1982?

4. Will the presence of the standard, instructional, demonstrate a significant difference between 1979 and 1982?

5. Will the presence of the standard, relationships with parents, demonstrate a significant difference between 1979 and 1982?

6. Will the presence of the standard, professional development, demonstrate a significant difference between 1979 and 1982?

7. Will the presence of the standard, communication between special education districts and local districts, demonstrate a significant difference between 1979 and 1982?

Definition of Terms

Standard--a statement established by general usage in teacher evaluation forms.

Criteria--statements to measure, judge the presence of a selected standard.

Discipline--treatment that corrects or punishes, to subject to discipline, train or control which results in desired patterns of behavior on the part of individuals or groups.

Behavior Management--act of a teacher's direct handling,

managing, controlling, and directing a student's behavior.

Classroom Management--act of a teacher's direct handling, managing, controlling, and directing of a classroom, monitoring of progress.

Instructional--a teacher's knowledge, information, given or taught to students, planning and delivery of the subject and monitoring progress.

Relationships with Parents--in accordance with Rules and Regulations to Govern Special Education, in the state of Illinois, including guardians, a statement for conference, cooperation, confidentiality, communication (Illinois Rules and Regulations to Govern the Administration and Operation of Special Education, 1979).

Professional Development--that which the teachers do for themselves to remain up-to-date, knowledgeable in their teaching position or area of expertise, activities of the district, compliance with school board/district rules and regulations.

Communication between Special Education District and Local District--procedures for communication and information for a special education class with a public school setting, compliance with district's school board rules and regulations/policies.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Research on teacher evaluation has been demonstrated to be a complex problem for educators, administrators, directors and the researcher. Evidence of disparity between the audience of publication, and the disparity which is contingent upon the audience of evaluation, comes to little agreement.

The audience of evaluation can be a supervisor, teacher, administrator, or a specialist. Classified judgment concerning teacher evaluation has furthered this problem. The questionable issue remains the same, what is the purpose of evaluation? Feldvebel (1980) adds: "the problem of defining effectiveness," and "the ingredients to a credible model" (p. 415).

Purposes for teacher evaluation have been viewed and discussed by different audiences. Researchers have generally concluded that teacher evaluation purposes are to improve instruction, measure student gains, and for employment, placement, tenure and dismissal of teachers. Research from an administrator's point of view presents purposes resultant of their position in the evaluation audience. Purposes from an administrative point of view have been found to be: termination of poor teachers (Ross, 1981), avoidance of grievance hearings (Gray, 1982), guide to teachers for hiring, retention, and promotion (Levin, 1979), morale-building for special teachers in a

host school (Winborne, 1981), and maintenance of discipline (Miller & Miller, 1971).

The major difficulty of determining teacher effectiveness is the lack of valid criteria (Douglass, 1961; Fattu, 1962; Feldvebel, 1980; Gage, 1963; Medley and Mitzel, 1963; Mitzel, 1960; Stinnett & Huggett, 1968; Thompson, 1981; & Westling, et al., 1981). The consistency of the criteria problem implies that researchers do not agree if teacher effectiveness is a statement of an attribute of a teacher in a particular teaching situation, or to assume that it is a statement about the results of a teaching situation.

Research on teacher evaluation criteria as it pertains to the evaluation can be divided into four categories of criteria types: presage, product, process, and process and product models (Feldvebel, 1980; Mitzel, 1960). Presage criteria includes teacher traits, psychological traits, and statements which are predictors of teacher effectiveness. Fattu (1962) tried to link such predictor criteria to teacher effectiveness and concluded that much research failed to substantiate such a comparison. Twelve predictors were linked: intelligence, knowledge of subject area, cultural background, socio-economic status, sex, marital status, teaching aptitude, job interest, voice-speech, special abilities and teacher failure (Fattu, 1962). Gage (1963) stated five characteristics which seem to be components of effective teaching: warmth, cognitive organization, orderliness, indirectness, and problem solving ability.

Researchers have linked presage criteria to be indicators of

pupil achievement. Student achievement has been considered to be the ultimate in criterion for teacher effectiveness. Medley and Mitzel (1963) state that although previous measures and ratings of teacher effectiveness have no relationship to effectiveness, this does not mean that the effectiveness cannot be measured in student progress. Contradictory to this statement, Brophy (1965) did not obtain significant relationships between twelve observational scales and student learning as predicted. The Metropolitan Achievement Test's (MAT) data were used as the indicator of teacher effectiveness and student progress. Achland (1976) reported that the results were similar to the Brophy 1965 study, but neither provided a random sample, and the MAT is crucial to both studies for validity.

The validity and effect of arbitrarily selected lists which presage criteria tends to state, remains under speculation by researchers. Credible evaluation must be supported by evidence which is objective (Hodgkinson, 1975). Glass (1974) established objective evaluation as research which has reliability, is observable, and has demonstrated a significant relationship to desired student outcome and effective status.

With knowledge that presage criteria lacks reliability and validity in research, the criteria appears on forms used by school districts. King (1978) found a high correlation of districts using the following criteria which by definition, fall into presage criteria: "voice, speech, use of English (85.7%), personal health, vitality, poise (78.6%), and personal appearance (75.0%)" (p. 26).

This sample is representative of 32 school districts which relies on rating sheets for the evaluation of their teachers. This is a strong indication that presage criteria are being used for the purpose of evaluating traits, not teaching. King (1978) concluded that revision of rating sheets was necessary to assess district priorities and goals, and the criteria should reflect that "district objectives and criteria identified in research on teacher effectiveness should improve the reliability of such reports" (p. 26).

Process criteria are criteria which are indicative of teacher behaviors. This might include classroom behavior, rapport, and individualization of instruction. Teacher observation is compatible with the notion of teacher growth and self-evaluation, because of the non-judgmental techniques which can be employed. Analyzing teacher behavior has been employed by several methods:

> Flanders Interaction Analysis, Galloway Non Verbal Communication, Parsontypes of Question Analysis, Bales Interaction Process Analysis, Verbal Interaction Category System, Classroom Observation Record, Briggs Observation Guide, video tape analysis, Oscar Observation Schedule and Record System (OSCAR), Instrument for the Observation of Teaching Activities (IOTA), rating scales, checklist and narrative reporting (Robinson, 1978, p. 5).

This type of criteria provides the teacher with feedback for the learning process occurring in the classroom, which can help a teacher's self-awareness. Process criteria does not rate a teacher or provide a specific model of teaching. Process criteria also depends upon a high level of trust and openness between the teacher and the supervisor and/or evaluator. The outcome of using observational techniques is not supportive of administrator's and teacher's rankings of an

evaluative system. Sapone (1981) found that the category of establishing goals was rated as the most important priority by teachers, and administrators ranked the category as 12 out of 18 categories (p. 29). "Identification of current and future-oriented goals" (Sapone, 1981, p. 29) was rated 13 by administrators and five by teachers. This disparity is congruent with a teacher's and an administrator's view on the purpose of teacher evaluation.

Observational conferences which occur as a routine procedure are part of the evaluative process and are supportive in a one-to-one initiation. Gordon (1976) found 50% of teachers in a sample of 362 found this kind of engaged process criteria was for supportive reasons. Principals perceived the observational conference to be for the instructional improvement of teachers with a 98% agreement, while teachers reported that the teacher-initiated conference was primarily for curriculum planning, which is not supportive for the process criteria intent to provide feedback to the teacher on observable behavior (Robinson, 1978).

Administrators ranked monitoring plans and formative evaluation process as one out of 18 components and professional growth as 13 out of 18 components (Sapone, 1981, p. 26). Teachers ranked monitoring and formative evaluation process 16 out of 18 components and professional growth four out of 18 components (Sapone, 1981, p. 26). The rankings provided by this study of teachers and administrators are not indicators of student achievement or improved teacher performance, but may contribute negatively to the adoption of

such process criteria in isolation on a teacher evaluation form. The ranking of teachers by process criteria provides feedback, but does not rate teachers on teacher effectiveness. If the validity of teacher performance is based on this single component, it is questionable (Feldvebel, 1980).

Product criteria depends on a set of goals toward which teaching is directed; measures of growth in skills, knowledge of subject matter, and attitudes. Product criteria depends on an outcome from which the teacher or administration has stated goals. Popham (1971) concludes that the teacher criteria should be written in terms of student outcomes, or in terms of the specific teacher behaviors which have been validated by research.

Dependent upon the audience for objective setting, product criteria requires "performance areas to be considered, what special areas to include in the evaluation, and the specific criteria to use" (Stow & Sweeney, 1981). Criteria which have been agreed upon by research as a level of competency are a consistent problem of evaluation (Thompson, 1981) and research is conflicting.

Redfern (1980) proposes responsibility criteria of "planning and organizing, motivating learners, relationships with students, utilization of resources, instructional techniques, professional growth and responsibility, and relationships with parents" (pp. 21-22). The chief reason for the 'Redfern Method' is to identify areas where improvement is needed. The problem with goal setting of this nature is the teacher identifying and setting realistic job targets.

Establishment of objectives for teacher evaluation has been demonstrated to be a reliable means and valid for a specific teaching group if the input meets teacher and administrative needs. Christner (1979) found a high agreement of competencies for teachers in a teacher evaluation revision of a form using competency-base evaluation. The input was from teachers, evaluators, students, parents and education professors.

Product criteria tends to be a traditional approach to teacher evaluation which requires the presence of specified traits, skills, methods, and are typified by checklists of characteristics (Bohnert, 1978). Objectives-based evaluation also is used to provide encouragement to teachers, build up achievement, and to point out strengths and weaknesses (Newton, 1980).

The combination of process-product would dictate an evaluation which provides teacher observation, growth, self-evaluation, pupil achievement, and supplies specific objectives toward which teaching is directed. The rationale for the alliance would be to increase credibility, and to measure the progress of the predetermined objectives (Stow & Sweeney, 1981). If the purpose of evaluation is agreed to be improvement of instruction, and to promote, dismiss or grant tenure, process-product criteria could be a more reliable indicator of teacher effectiveness than any of the factors alone.

Supportive of this concept is the consistency of process-product criteria which are demonstrated through research. Christner

(1979) grouped six categories of competencies and derived 63 select competencies to utilize in teacher evaluation. The research demonstrated a high agreement on competencies thought to be most important for effective teachers (Christner, 1979). The research is an indication of agreement, but lacks an appropriate test of validity and reliability for the use of the instrument.

The analysis of process-product relationships in research has been addressed by R. S. Soar (1978). Soar (1978) poses the problem of analyzing teacher effectiveness data to be "estimating pupil gain, grouping observation items, and relating gains to classroom behavior" (p. 114). Carey (1980) found at the state-level, four in 21 states included policies for valid instruments, and two in 21 states included policies for reliable measurements. All 21 states included policies for the purpose of their evaluations of teachers (Carey, 1980). If the contradiction of established policies for evaluation and the means of gathering process-product criteria were more efficient, it could lead to increased reliability of indicators of teacher effectiveness.

One means to gather the criteria is to analyze the teacher evaluation form. Fox and Tubb (1979) reviewed forms and selected criteria which consistently appeared, to be rated by administrators. Regardless of the type of evaluation form, or its rating system, "teachers knowledge in his/her subject area" was found in twenty-seven of sixty-six forms (Fox & Tubb, 1979, p. 3).

Discipline is chosen as a standard by this researcher

resultant of The School Code of Illinois, Article 24, Section 24, paragraph 1, "teachers and other certified educational employees shall maintain discipline in the schools . . ." (p. 155).

Research demonstrates specific criteria which are consistently indicators of the perceived standard, discipline. Christner's (1979) competency list includes maintenance of class control in an atmosphere conducive to learning. "Control of class, rapport with students," was indicated in 96.4% of 28 school principals to be on the teacher evaluation form (King, 1978, p. 24). Gargiulo & Pigge (1979) state the "ability to maintain order in a classroom and to assist in the development of self-discipline" in a comparison of regular and special educators perceived need and proficiency of stated competencies (p. 341). Special education teachers rated this competency as adequately proficient, 13.5 and first in need when rating 26 total competency areas. This is a strong indication for the standard in special education teacher evaluation.

Westling (1981) found in a sample of perceived 'superior' special education teachers, that the use of reinforcement and punishment tactics was an indicator of a 'superior' teacher versus an 'average' special education teacher. Reinforcement and punishment are basic concepts to the special educator and result in treatment which corrects or punishes, or a desired pattern of behavior, which is the definition of discipline for this research.

Behavior management is chosen as a standard for this research resultant of Illinois Rules and Regulations to Govern the

Administration and Operation of Special Education, Article 9.18a. This specifically states at the IEP meeting short-term objectives must be written and criteria developed for those objectives. The long-range goals often include behavioral areas (i.e. increasing social behaviors directed towards others) and objectives to reach that goal. Acceptable behavior is imperative to the success of the mainstreamed child, and is often a priority of the special educator.

Christner (1979) utilized the criteria, "uses behavior management techniques which preserve student and teacher dignity and self-esteem if problems arise" (p. 15). Christner's (1979) competency statement is vague and this researcher added the steps of planning, delivery, assessment, implementation, to be reflective of Article 9.18a (Illinois Rules and Regulations to Govern the Administration and Operation of Special Education, 1979).

The "ability to construct behavioral performance objectives in subject matter field" was rated by special education teachers (Gargiulo & Pigge, 1979, p. 341). Special education teachers rated the competency statement 13th in terms of need and first in proficiency with the competency. The ranking disparity may be a result of objective writing being traditionally associated with special education teaching practices, and the proficiency ranking of first, due to teacher education institution or in-service.

Classroom management is chosen as a standard for this research. Thomas (1974) found that managing instruction or the ability to resolve discipline problems, was stressed to be a competency area

receiving the most number of items for priority; seven categories for rating teacher competencies. Christner (1979) listed classroom management to be a category for criteria analysis, using "organizes the class routine so that little time is lost in transition from one learning activity to another," and "maintains class control in an atmosphere conducive to learning" (p. 15). King (1978) concluded that 71.4% of reviewed school districts had the stated criterion "attention to records and routine matters" (p. 24). Classroom management appears as a criteria area in King's (1978) study to assess teaching performance.

Special education teachers perceived the competency statement, "ability to motivate student achievement via modeling, reinforcement, provision of success experiences, and appeal to student interests" as a need which was ranked second in twenty-six competency statements, and third as claiming proficiency with that competency (Gargiulo & Pigge, 1979, p. 341). This specific competency statement is supportive of the standard, classroom management, chosen for this research.

Classroom management was cited as a 'section' for the development of competencies traditionally associated with special education teaching practices for 'superior' teachers (Westling, 1981). Westling (1981) found that 'superior' versus 'average' teachers commonly used reinforcement and punishment tactics which "ignores inappropriate behavior and reinforces appropriate behavior" to be answered affirmatively by 51% of those teachers (p. 360). This item

supports the criterion statement, "teacher response appropriate to appropriate behavior" selected for this research for the standard: discipline.

Instructional is chosen as a standard for this research resultant of Illinois Rules and Regulations to Govern the Administration and Operation of Special Education, Article 9. The Individualized Educational Program (IEP) requires teachers to provide specific objectives, long and short term, to be an implementator of the IEP, and to include the goals necessary to attain the stated objectives. The IEP is the special educator's process that includes diagnosis, staffing, programming, and review of the student's educational program (Hill, 1980).

Christner (1979) cited "instructional" as a selected competency area for research. "Preparing written lessons, and designing lessons which incorporate a variety of materials, instructional techniques and learning experiences" is directly associated with the IEP process, and this researcher's selected criteria (Christner, p. 14). King (1978) found that 100% of the administrators included effective use of methods and material was on their rating forms.

The "ability to individualize instruction to meet the varying needs of students . . ." was perceived to be a needed competency by special educators, who ranked it 6.5 out of 26 competencies (Gargiulo & Pigge, 1979, p. 341). The same competency statement was rated four in terms of need by regular educators, with a proficiency rating

difference of four for special educators, and 13.5 for regular educators. This rating may be indicative of the special education population in the regular classrooms, and the regular teacher rating proficiency for individualizing instruction significantly lower than special educators. Educators agreed that 47% of the ability to individualize instruction results from work experience, and the demand of the regular and special educator is different in this area (Pigge, 1978).

Ratings of 'superior' teachers demonstrated that 69% of 'superior' teachers "keep records or graphs of individual performance" (Westling, 1981, p. 361) which is supportive of this researcher's criterion, evaluation, and recording of student progress for the standard instructional. 'Superior' teachers were also found to deliver small group instruction versus large group and "one-to-one instruction for at least one-third of the day," which 28% of demonstrated 'superior' teachers responded to affirmatively (Westling, 1981, p. 360).

Relationships with parents is chosen as a standard for this research resultant of The Federal Register, August 23, 1977, Section 121a., 345, Section 121a., 384 and Section 121a., 502 (Vergason & McAfee, 1979). The parent must be viewed as a 'committee member' to the IEP process. For the parent, these responsibilities could include: "provide information concerning home situation, provide input for development of goals for the child, provide support for child evaluation and planning/placement" (National Association of State

Directors of Special Education, 1976, p. 18). The parents' 'invitation' to the IEP staffing, providing input to the IEP, and the access to the child's records, is directly associated with the special education teacher. The teacher provides input as a 'committee member' and this input is to be agreed upon by the parent and other members. The special educator must respect confidentiality of the parent, and follow IEP procedures for parental involvement (Vergason & McAfee, 1979).

Interpersonal skills is a category selected by Christner (1979) and includes "communicates with parents sympathetically, accurately and with understanding" (p. 16). Administrators reported that 53.6% of the teacher evaluation forms had the criterion "attitude toward parents and community" as an indicator of assessing teaching performance (King, 1978, p. 24). Data depicted in the area of professional interaction, 'superior' teachers were more involved than 'average' special education teachers with school personnel and with parents, yielding a 40% affirmative statement to meeting regularly with student's parents (Westling, 1981).

Professional development is chosen as a standard for this research resultant of The School Code of Illinois, 1979, Article 24-5, "the school boards may require teacher in their employ to furnish from time to time evidence of continued professional growth" (p. 155). The special education classroom located in a public school is regulated by the Illinois Office of Education and the "Operating State Agency," including standards [illegible] educational personnel" (The School

Code of Illinois, 1979, Article 14-8.01, paragraph 1). Although the special educator is legally excluded (The School Code of Illinois, 1979, Article 14-9.01, paragraph 2), the promotion of a positive attitude toward special education and engaging in local district activities, can be an indicator of professionalism.

Personal and professional qualities are a cited standard for competency development in Christner's (1979) item analysis study. The criteria "demonstrates professional growth, recognizes the necessity for and complies with administrative policies and procedures, and works effectively with teacher, student teachers and support personnel" is supportive of this researcher's criteria selection for the standard professional growth (Christner, 1979, p. 14). Similarly, King (1978) reported administrator's citation of "follows course of study, 17.9%, relations with staff, 64.3%, attitude toward parents and community, 53.6%, and professional advancement, 57.1%" to be the criteria in actual use for assessing teacher performance (p. 24).

Garguilo and Pigge (1979) found that special educators rated the competency statement, "ability to continue the development and clarification of one's own philosophy of education," ninth in terms of teacher's perceived need, and proficiency in the competency was rated eighth out of 26 competency statements (p. 361). Pigge (1978) established that educators perceived this competency statement to develop in work experience by an agreement of 40% when rated by educators. This is an indication that professional growth occurs

within the school, and is not solely the responsibility of the schools. Professional growth activities within the school are indigenous to the school, and the activities rise out of the demand of change and daily living (Rubin, 1975).

'Superior' special education teachers responded affirmatively 44% versus 12% 'average' special educators to the statement, "provide in-service training for non-special education personnel in the school or district," and "assist guidance counselor and/or conduct counseling for exceptional students, 58% 'superior' teachers responded 'yes'" (Westling, 1981, p. 362). It can be concluded that the professional development of an educator is never sufficient, and continuing effort to develop the professional teacher, regardless of the placement of the classroom, or the governing district, will improve instruction. The improvement of instruction is a purpose of evaluation of teachers.

Communication between the special education district and the local district has been chosen as a standard for this research resultant of The School Code of Illinois, 1979, Article 14-8.01 (p. 95). If the special education services are rendered through the local district, The State Board of Education, in Illinois, is the evaluator of the local school district's individualized educational program for each child. The School Code of Illinois, 1979, Article 14-8.02 (p. 95) provides that the 'least restrictive environment' must be provided to each handicapped child. For the special educator, this includes mainstreaming children, and providing communication within the local school of the expectations of that child. The

communication set by the special educator within the local school can establish a positive attitude toward special education and acceptance.

The special educator within a public school can improve an attitude of acceptance through compliance with the school board policies and procedures which is a criterion assessed by Christner (1979). Within a survey of public school administrators, King (1978) found that 64.3% of administrators cited attitude toward supervision appeared on the actual teacher evaluation form. It is this researcher's assumption that many special educators are evaluated by their host school as well as by the special education district. Compliance with the school's evaluation policies, and the special educator's attitude toward that evaluation is imperative to maintain good communication.

The "ability to utilize an understanding of the formal chain of control, decision making, communication, and authority with each school unit and their effects upon the daily operation of the classroom," is a stated competency rated by regular and special education teachers (Gargiulo & Pigge, 1979, p. 341). Special education teachers rated the competency statement tenth in terms of need and eleventh in terms of proficiency. Regular education teachers rated eleventh in terms of need, and thirteenth in terms of proficiency. Although the difference is minimal, both groups of teachers rated this competency in the upper 50% of the total possible list.

When 'superior' teachers were queried as to consulting with regular teachers as a part of their responsibilities in teaching duty,

58% responded affirmatively. This would support the necessity for good communication if the child is "mainstreamed into a regular education classroom" (Westling, 1981). 'Superior' teachers also reported with a frequency of 78%, that keeping the principal informed of a student's progress was important (Westling, 1981).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

The subjects for this research were directors of special education districts, assistants to the director, and directors of joint agreements.

The names and addresses were obtained through the Illinois Office of Education (IOE) in 1979 and obtained from the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) in 1982. The IOE supplied this researcher with 131 mailing labels with current names and addresses for 1979 and ISBE provided 150 mailing labels in 1982. A copy of this correspondence is in Appendix A.

Instrumentation

Data were obtained from special education teacher evaluation forms. A content analysis was performed for each teacher evaluation form. A blank content analysis form used in this research is in Appendix B.

Each standard selected for this research appeared in sequential order most commonly viewed in the teacher evaluation forms. The order appeared as follows: discipline, behavior management, classroom management, instructional, relationships with parents, professional development, and communication between special education and local district.

Each standard's specific criteria for measurement was numbered. Numeration on the content analysis form was as follows:

Discipline Standard

1 adequate control of classroom
2 defined classroom procedures/rules/regulations
3 provides for reinforcement as well as punishment

Behavior Management Standard

1 develops written behavioral management objectives as needed/planning
2 implementation consistent with behavior management objectives delivery
3 student's progress is recorded/assessment
4 develops/implements effective behavior management strategies/implementation

Classroom Management Standard

1 positive emotional climate
2 classroom management techniques
3 recognition of student achievement
4 consistent, fair, impartial
5 teacher response appropriate to appropriate behavior

Instructional Standard

1 daily lesson plans
2 IEP development/management
3 provides individualized instruction, varied materials, methods
4 evaluation and recording of student progress

Relationships with Parents Standard

1 respects confidentiality of student/parent
2 follows procedures for parent involvement in IEP process
3 maintains verbal/written contacts with parents
4 records verbal/written contacts with parents
5 informs administration of parent concerns

Professional Development Standard

1 promotes positive attitude toward special education
2 engages in activities, readings, study to maintain professional expertise in area

3 attends/supervises in-service/workshops
4 effective communication with support personnel
5 effective communication with local district; cooperative relationships
6 community and public relations

Communication Between Special Education District and Local District Standard

1 observes host school rules and regulations
2 uses proper channels of communication
3 incorporates policies/philosophies in conjunction with special education district
4 demonstrates knowledge and utilization of local district and special education curriculum

Method

This researcher labeled 131 and 150 envelopes to special education districts for 1979 and 1982. Each envelope was labeled with a self-addressed stamped envelope (sase) enclosed. This researcher requested a copy of the teacher evaluation form most commonly used. This request is in Appendix C. To increase credibility and an adequate return of teacher evaluation forms, the Center on Evaluation Development and Research (CEDR) tendered a support letter which was included in the requests to districts (Appendix D).

Each sase provided a coded return that corresponded to mailing labels. As the teacher evaluation form was returned, it was checked off the coded returns for 1979 and 1982 mailing lists. Sixty-six teacher evaluation forms were returned for 1979, and 77 teacher evaluation forms were returned for 1982. The last 11 returns for 1982 were excluded from the research. This action was taken to allow for two equal bodies of data. Each teacher evaluation form was masked for any identifying information to respect confidentiality of the

cooperating districts. Teacher evaluation forms were coded A1-A66 for 1979, and B1-B66 for 1982.

Analysis of Results

Each teacher evaluation form was scored on all seven standards. If the criterion appeared in that standard through review of the form, it was scored X. If the criterion did not appear in that standard, it was scored as a blank. A mean was derived for each criterion statement for each standard. A mean was derived for each standard for 1979 and 1982. Increases or decreases of specific criterion were discussed. Correlated t was considered and rejection for use, due to destroying confidentiality and materially reducing n. A t of independent means, one-tail, was used as an alternative to t for correlated means. The following formula was used:

$$t = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\sum d^2 + \sum d^2}{N_1 + N_2 - 2}\right)\left(\frac{N_1 + N_2}{N_1 + N_2 2}\right)}}$$

$$df = N_1 + N_2 - 2$$

(Isaac, 1971, p. 134)

An extrapolated t was used due to the degrees of freedom (df) equaling 130, which extends beyond t table limits in the text which was used (Edwards, 1967). The alpha level for this paper was set at .05.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The seven selected standards for this research: discipline, behavior management, classroom management, instructional, relationships with parents, professional development, and communication between special education districts and local districts, were examined in each teacher evaluation form for 1979 and 1982. The number of specific criteria in each standard were as follows: discipline, 3; behavior management, 4; classroom management, 5; instructional, 4; relationships with parents 5; professional development, 6; and communication between special education districts and local districts, 4.

Upon reivew of each teacher evaluation form, each criterion was scored (X = appearance of stated criterion, blank = nonappearance of stated criterion) according to this researcher's definition of terms. Totals of criteria statements were derived for each teacher evaluation form for 1979 and 1982, and the total criteria statements for 1979 and 1982, inclusive (n = 66 teacher evaluation forms scored for 1979 and 1982). A mean was calculated for each criterion statement for each standard for 1979 and 1982.

The results of specific criterion and means are presented in Table 1 (1979) and Table 2 (1982).

A total of 329 criteria were scored for 1979 and 412 criteria

TABLE 1

1979 SPECIFIC CRITERION TOTALS AND MEANS

Standard	Criterion	X	$\overline{X}$
Discipline	1	15	.22
Discipline	2	6	.09
Discipline	3	1	.01
Behavior Management	1	8	.12
Behavior Management	2	4	.06
Behavior Management	3	4	.06
Behavior Management	4	4	.06
Classroom Management	1	15	.22
Classroom Management	2	7	.10
Classroom Management	3	10	.15
Classroom Management	4	10	.15
Classroom Management	5	9	.13
Instructional	1	23	.34
Instructional	2	19	.28
Instructional	3	32	.48
Instructional	4	13	.19
Relationships With Parents	1	9	.13
Relationships With Parents	2	4	.06
Relationships With Parents	3	6	.09
Relationships With Parents	4	6	.09
Relationships With Parents	5	3	.04

TABLE 1--Continued

Standard	Criterion	X	$\overline{X}$
Professional Development	1	7	.10
Professional Development	2	17	.25
Professional Development	3	18	.27
Professional Development	4	16	.24
Professional Development	5	22	.33
Professional Development	6	11	.16
Communication Between Sp. Ed. Local District	1	16	.24
Communication Between Sp. Ed. Local District	2	4	.06
Communication Between Sp. Ed. Local District	3	4	.06
Communication Between Sp. Ed. Local District	4	6	.09
TOTAL		329	

n = total number of teacher evaluation forms (66)

X = total ranked criterion

$\overline{X}$ = mean

TABLE 2

1982 SPECIFIC CRITERION TOTALS AND MEANS

Standard	Criterion	X	$\bar{X}$
Discipline	1	14	.21
Discipline	2	7	.10
Discipline	3	11	.16
Behavior Management	1	9	.13
Behavior Management	2	5	.07
Behavior Management	3	9	.13
Behavior Management	4	9	.13
Classroom Management	1	20	.30
Classroom Management	2	17	.25
Classroom Management	3	13	.19
Classroom Management	4	7	.10
Classroom Management	5	8	.12
Instructional	1	27	.40
Instructional	2	17	.25
Instructional	3	44	.66
Instructional	4	25	.37
Relationships With Parents	1	12	.18
Relationships With Parents	2	2	.03
Relationships With Parents	3	6	.09
Relationships With Parents	4	4	.06
Relationships With Parents	5	0	.00

TABLE 2--Continued

Standard	Criterion	X	$\overline{X}$
Professional Development	1	1	.01
Professional Development	2	21	.31
Professional Development	3	22	.33
Professional Development	4	16	.24
Professional Development	5	25	.37
Professional Development	6	8	.12
Communication Between Sp. Ed. Local District	1	27	.40
Communication Between Sp. Ed. Local District	2	6	.09
Communication Between Sp. Ed. Local District	3	13	.19
Communication Between Sp. Ed. Local District	4	17	.10
TOTAL		412	

n = total number of teacher evaluation forms (66)

X = total ranked criterion

$\overline{X}$ = mean

were scored for 1982 which reflects an increase in 1982 of 83 criterion scores. Sixty-six teacher evaluation forms were scored for each year, yielding a total criteria score of 2,046 possibilities.

Criteria scores in each standard, means for 1979 and 1982, and t score results appear in Table 3. The results for 1979 and 1982, and t score results appear in Table 3. The results for 1979 and 1982 mean $\bar{X}$ difference were as follows: Discipline = .05, Behavior Management = .05, Classroom Management = .04, Instructional = .10, Relationships with Parents = .01, Professional Development = .01, and Communication Between Special Education and Local District = .09.

The t test for two independent means, one-tailed, was found to be significant at the .05 level with t equaling 1.63 or greater. There was no standard significant at this level. t values were as follows: Discipline, t = 1.19; Behavior Management, t = 1.25; Classroom Management, t = -.28; Instructional, t = .59; Relationships With Parents, t = .22; Professional Development, t = -.15; and Communication Between Special Education and Local District, t = -.0007.

Data Summary

A total of 2,046 criterion rankings were possible for 1979 and 1982. Tables 1 and 2 demonstrate a total of 329 for 1979 and 412 for 1982. Table 3 presented the mean for 1979 and 1982, with differences as noted. t scores for two independent means, one-tailed, at the .05 level of significance presented no standard with statistically significant findings.

TABLE 3

1979; 1982 TOTAL CRITERION STANDARD RANK, MEANS, AND t VALUES

Standard	n	1979 X	1982 X	1979 $\bar{X}$	1982 $\bar{X}$	t
Discipline	198	22	32	.11	.16	1.19
Behavior Management	264	20	32	.07	.12	1.25
Classroom Management	330	51	65	.15	.19	-.28
Instructional	264	87	113	.32	.42	.59
Relationships With Parents	330	28	24	.08	.07	.22
Professional Development	396	91	93	.22	.23	-.15
Communication Between Sp. Ed. Local District	264	30	53	.11	.20	-.0007
TOTAL	2046	329	412	.16	.20	*

n = total criterion possible

X = total criterion ranked

$\bar{X}$ = mean

t = t values for two independent means, one-tailed

* = .05 level; t is significant at 1.63

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This researcher listed seven research questions in Chapter V and each will be discussed. Implications for special education teacher evaluation will be examined.

Research Question 1. Will the presence of the standard, discipline, demonstrate a significant difference between 1979 and 1982?

The standard of discipline did not present a statistically significant difference between 1979 and 1982. It can be noted that 'growth' in the criterion statement of discipline (3), provides for reinforcement as well as punishment, occurred. This can be an indication for special education considerations within the public schools. This may also account for the drop in ranked criterion for adequate control of the classroom, discipline (1). The criterion which specifically states "control" or "discipline" may hold negative connotations for the administrator and teachers, even if the criterion is required by law (The School Code of Illinois, Article 24, Section 24, paragraph 1). The low rankings of discipline (2), defined classroom procedures/rules/regulations, is an indication that the teacher evaluation form does not account for the special educator, even within a host school. The teacher evaluation forms being used by administrators to evaluate special education teachers does not comply

with state law, and in this researcher's opinion does not account for the special education evaluative differences in the forms currently being used to evaluate its teachers.

Research Question 2. Will the presence of the standard, behavior management, demonstrate a significant difference between 1979 and 1982?

The standard of behavior management did not present a statistically significant difference between 1979 and 1982. 'Growth' can be demonstrated in the criterion, assessment (3), and implementation (4) of behavior management strategies. Assessing student progress and recording progress is a method to collect the data needed to demonstrate improved performance. The improved performance of students is an indicator of teacher effectiveness, or a purpose of teacher evaluation. For the special educator, the forms currently being used do not account for objectives which are behavioral in nature. The ability to plan, deliver, assess and implement objectives is the special educator's responsibility, and required by law (Illinois Rules and Regulations to Govern the Administration and Operation of Special Education, Article 24, Section 5, paragraph 1). This is an indication the special education teacher evaluation forms currently being used to evaluate teachers do not account for special education differences, and do not comply with state or federal implications of the law. This includes behavioral IEP goals and objectives, educational services to be provided, and implications of the least restrictive environment, all of which are functions of

the placement committee. The management of a student's behavior is often the factor which determines "mainstreaming" and providing the least restrictive environment within the public school. It is this researcher's opinion that the teacher evaluation forms currently being used do not account for this factor, and are in need of revision.

Research Question 3. Will the presence of the standard, classroom management, demonstrate a significant difference between 1979 and 1982?

The standard of classroom management did not present a statistically significant difference between 1979 and 1982. 'Growth' is indicated in the criterion statement (2), classroom management techniques. For 1982, 10 additional rankings occurred for this specific criterion. This may be an indication for administrators' and/or teachers' perceived need for an evaluative statement which also accounts for discipline within the classroom. The criterion of positive emotional climate (1), in the area of classroom management totaled more rankings than any of the classroom management criterion (27). This criterion is an 'observable' statement and was used in rating sheets most commonly, with no observation cited. Contradictory to this ranking, criterion (4), consistent, fair, impartial ranked 17 teacher evaluation forms which used this as a criterion for evaluation of teachers. It may be an indication that the "emotional climate" versus "consistent, fair, impartial" lends itself to fewer judgments made arbitrarily by administrators/teachers. The criterion (3), recognition of student achievement, received 23 rankings and can

be indicative of the teacher/administrative need to evaluate on the basis of improved student achievement which is an indicator of teacher performance. It is this researcher's opinion that based on these research findings, classroom management criterion need to include the observational techniques and to be systematic in these observations. Arbitrarily criterion ranked in the area of classroom management may decrease one of the purposes of evaluation: improved teacher and student performance.

Research Question 4. Will the presence of the standard, instructional, demonstrate a significant difference between 1979 and 1982?

The standard of instructional did not present a statistically significant difference between 1979 and 1982. 'Growth' was found in the criterion statement (3), provides individualized instruction, materials/methods, and criterion statement (4), evaluation and recording of student progress. It is this researcher's opinion that both of these criterion statements have special education inclinations, and are directly associated with the IEP process. The criterion for individualized instruction received 12 more rankings in 1982. This is an indication that the form being used to evaluate special education teachers provides for this process. The use of appraisal teacher evaluation without preset criteria may have lowered this ranking. The criterion (2) IEP development/management received a total ranking of 36. This is an indication that the special education teacher may be evaluated on their ability to individualize

instruction (criterion 3), but is not evaluated on their compliance of law statute (Illinois Rules and Regulations to Govern the Administration and Operation of Special Education, Article 9). It is this researcher's opinion that the standard of instructional does not comply with state law or account for the special education evaluative differences, based on these findings.

Research Question 5. Will the presence of the standard, relationships with parents, demonstrate a significant difference between 1979 and 1982?

The standard of relationships with parents did not present a statistically significant difference between 1979 and 1982. 'Growth' in the criterion statement (1) respects confidentiality of student/parent increases by three rankings. This standard provides a marked difference between special education teacher evaluation and the public schools. The special education teacher clearly is not being evaluated on confidentiality, IEP procedures for parent involvement, and maintaining contact with the parents, resultant of this research. Parents have the right to attendance at the IEP meeting, input to their child's IEP, and access to "review and inspect all educational records" (Vergason & McAfee, 1979, pp. i-iii). It is this researcher's opinion that within the findings of this research, special education districts are in violation of federal statute, and do not account for the special education teacher within the public school, or a special educationdistrict. The implications of these

findings warrant revision, update, and a serious look at the standard for relationships with parents.

Research Question 6. Will the presence of the standard, professional development, demonstrate a significant difference between 1979 and 1982?

The standard of professional development did not present a statistically significant difference between 1979 and 1982. 'Growth' is demonstrated in three of the criterion statements. These criterion statements involve the teacher directly, and are supportive of teacher growth. In comparison to the other research standards, professional growth criteria was the most evident in the form, and stated simply. This increase may be due in part to more teacher involvement in the evaluative process, or administrative concerns for communication and cooperation within specific districts. A decrease of three rankings for the criterion (6), community and public relations between 1979 and 1982 may be an indication that these relations are not indicators of teacher effectiveness, rather meeting district or managerial needs. The decrease in the criterion statement (1) promotes positive attitude toward special education (seven rankings, 1979; one ranking, 1982) is supportive of research findings not accounting for special education evaluative differences. This decrease with special education classrooms moving to the public schools, would indicate that the teacher evaluation forms currently being used are that of the public school, and in the area of professional development, will not account for special education evaluative

differences. It is this researcher's opinion that in the area of in-service, and keeping 'up-to-date' for the professional special educator, this area is crucial to increasing teacher effectiveness and performance.

Research Question 7. Will the presence of the standard, communication between special education districts and local districts, demonstrate a significant difference between 1979 and 1982?

The standard of communication between special education districts and local districts did not present a statistically significant difference between 1979 and 1982. 'Growth' is demonstrated in the four criteria. The criterion statement (1), observes host school rules and regulations, ranked 16 in 1979 and 27 in 1982. This is an indication that the special education district is directing administrative and managerial tasks to the public schools, and the special education teacher is responsible for this chain of command. It can be assumed that the increases in this area are an indication that more responsibility is given to the public schools. Indicative to this research, special education districts did cite no teacher evaluation form currently being used, rather the form the district provided, supportive of the research finding that special education evaluative differences are not accounted for in the public schools. It is this researcher's opinion that special education teachers are currently being evaluated on their performance within the public schools' administrative rules and regulations, and the special

education administrative rules and regulations which could provide evaluative differences in compliance with state and federal statute, are not accounted for.

Summary of Results

The seven selected standards for this research did not demonstrate a statistically significant difference between teacher evaluation forms of 1979 and 1982. Examination of specific criterion within each standard did demonstrate 'growth' in the stated criterion between 1979 and 1982. The increase in the number of rankings for a selected criterion did indicate compliance with state and federal mandates with special education. Decreases in specific criterion were resultant of administrative/managerial perceived needs, and not resultant of improved special education teacher effectiveness. Increases in specific criterion occurred most frequently in the areas of discipline, instructional, professional development, and communication between special education district and local district. Decreases, or low rankings, occurred in the area of relationships with parents. Analysis of specific criteria statements demonstrated research findings which are supportive of this researcher's problem statement. Quantitative differences were found in the specific criterion statements, and the reliability of the selected standards for research, which are indicators of state and federal statute, demonstrated that the evaluative differences of special and regular education are not accounted for in the teacher evaluation forms used to evaluate its special educators in the State of Illinois.

Implications

This research demonstrates the lack of reliable standards and specific criterion within special education teacher evaluation forms for the State of Illinois, in the years 1979 and 1982. To increase the reliability that the existence of standards do occur, ranking questionnaires could be utilized with the same administrators and teachers of the district. The ranking questionnaire could clarify that the selected standards are deemed important in the evaluation of special educators. Pairing the standards with federal and state statute could be a viable means to determine perceived need and actual compliance. Presenting federal and state statute to administrators and teachers for evaluative purposes may increase the reliability of the specific standards used to evaluate teachers which are in compliance with federal and state statute.

Indicative of this research is the need for a clear purpose of evaluation of special educators to include compliance with the federal and state implications. The establishment of policies and procedures to comply is a critical question for special education districts and joint agreements in the State of Illinois. Resultant of these research findings, if the proposed standards do present reliable standards and are directly associated with federal and state statute, the special education districts and joint agreements in the State of Illinois are in a severe need of revision of the teacher evaluation forms being used to evaluate its teachers. This area is

in definite need of additional research to demonstrate the reliability of the posed question.

An implication for further research is to examine the standards presented. A replication of this research to determine if the standards chosen for research do not appear, are there standards present which are not included, or different than those selected for this research? This question poses the need for possible investigation and additional research.

Special education districts and joint agreements utilizing an appraisal or narrative form, and those stating the usage of the teacher evaluation form provided by the governing district, could be queried if they included standards, or provide specific criteria to the teacher or district. This researcher viewed forms and responses which could not be ranked due to the lack of the actual form, or stated criteria. The possible investigation into this questioning could provide valuable data to the problem of existing standards in special education teacher evaluation.

Limitations of the Research

This research was limited to those administrators who responded to the request letter for the teacher evaluation form currently being used. A mail-out at a different month may have provided a different sampling, or the timing of the mail-out could restrict or increase the actual return.

The request letter could have included the statement, "If your special education teachers are evaluated by a different district and

utilize a different form, please mail that form." This statement could have increased the return, or provided additional data. This statement could provide data which demonstrates special education standards are reflective in the form, or do not account for special education evaluative differences.

The research is based upon the researcher's ability to non-arbitrarily rank selected criteria. Error in tabulation, viewing of the actual form, and interpretation of criteria could be limited to researcher's bias.

The selection of standards and criterion used in this research, although substantiated and reviewed in research to conform to federal and state statute, can be a limitation resultant of researcher partiality with selection of standards and criteria which are traditionally associated with special education teaching practices.

REFERENCES

Achland, H. Stability of teacher effectiveness: A replication. Journal of Educational Research, 1976, 68, 289-92.

Bohnert, D. Individualizing teacher evaluation. Contemporary Education, 1978, 49(2), 96-101.

Bolton, D. L. Selection and evaluation of teachers. Berkeley, CA: McCuthan Publishing Company, 1973.

Brophy, J. E. Classroom observation scales stability across time context and relationships with student learning gains. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1975, 67, 873-78.

Carey, L. M. State-local teacher performance education policies, professional development occasional paper 1. Syracuse, NY: National Council of States on In-Service Education, 1980. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 195 540.)

Center on evaluation development and research. Evaluation of Professionals in Education. St. Louis Chapter Phi Delta Kappan Newsletter, February, 1979.

Christner, C. A. Competency-based teacher evaluation in a school district: Validation of the competencies important by district administrators, professionals, students, and parents. Texas Office of Research and Evaluation: Austin Independent School District, 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 177 213.)

Douglass, H. R., Bent, R. K., & Boardman, C. W. Democratic supervision in secondary schools (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1961.

Ehrenberg, L. M. & Brandt, R. S. Improved student learning: A necessary goal of staff development. Educational Leadership, 1976, 34, 205-09.

Edwards, A. L. Statistical methods (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1967.

Fattu, N. A. Effectiveness--An elusive quality. Educational Digest, 1962, 27, 24-26.

The Federal Register, Tuesday, August 23, 1977, Part II.

Feldvebel, A. M. Teacher evaluation: Ingredients of a credible model. The Clearing House, 1980, 53, 415-20.

Fox, C. C. & Tubb, G. An item analysis of teacher evaluation forms as a mandate of legislative accountability, 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 175 815.)

Gage, N. L. Paradigms for research on teaching. In N. Gage (ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

Gallup, G. 13th annual Gallup poll. Phi Delta Kappan, 1981, 63, 33-47.

Gargiulo, R. M. & Pigge, F. R. Perceived competencies of elementary and special education teachers. Journal of Educational Research, 1979, 72, 339-43.

Glass, G. V. Teacher effectiveness. In Herbert J. Walbert (ed.), Evaluating educational performance: A source book of methods, instruments, and examples. Berkeley, CA: McCuthan Publishing Company, 1974.

Gordon, B. Teachers evaluate supervisors' behavior in the individual conference. The Clearing House, 1976, 49, 231-33.

Gray, F. Guidelines for administrators in evaluating teachers. Educational Digest, 1982, 47, 36-38.

Hill, D. Development of the individualized program. In Resource Guide for Vocational Personnel Serving Mental Health/ Developmentally Disabled Clients, contractual agreement, #RD5-A9225, Illinois State Board of Education, Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education, Illinois Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities, 1980.

Hodgkinson, H. L. Improving and assessing performance. Berkeley, CA: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1975.

Illinois rules and regulations to govern the administration and operation of special education. State Board of Education. Illinois Office of Education, February, 1979.

Isaac, S. Handbook in research and evaluation. San Diego, CA: EDITS Publishers, 1971.

King, R. A. Reliable rating sheets: A key to effective teacher evaluation. National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1978, 6[illegible], 21-25.

Klahn, R. P. Evaluation of teacher competency. Milwaukee: Franklin Publishing, 1965.

Levin, B. Teacher evaluation--A review of research. Educational Leadership, 1976, 37, 240-45.

Marks, M. B. Effective teacher evaluation. National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1976, 60, 1-7.

Medley, D. M. & Mitzel, H. E. Measuring classroom behavior by systematic observation. In Handbook of Research on Teaching, Rand McNally, 1963, 247-328.

Metropolitan Achievement Test. Available from: ACS Interpretative Scoring Systems. Minneapolis, MN: Psychological Corporation.

Miller, C. & Miller, D. The importance of certain personal qualities and professional competencies in successful classroom teaching. Journal of Teacher Education, 1971, 22, 37-39.

Mitzel, H. E. Teacher effectiveness. In Chester W. Harris (ed.), Encyclopedia of educational research. New York: MacMillan, 1960.

National Association of State Directors of Special Education. Functions of the placement committee in special education: A resource manual. Washington, D.C., 1979.

Newton, R. R. Teacher evaluation: Focus on outcomes. Peabody Journal of Education, 1980, 58, 45-54.

Pigge, F. Teacher competencies: Need, proficiency and where the proficiency was developed. Journal of Teacher Education, 1978, 29, 70-76.

Popham, James W. Performance tests of teaching proficiency: Rationale, development, and validation. American Educational Research, 1971, 8, 105-17.

Redfern, G. B. Evaluation teachers and administrators: A performance approach. Boulder, CO: West View Press, 1980.

Robinson, G. Evaluating teacher performance. Educational Research Service, Inc., 1978.

Ross, J. Here's how your teachers should be evaluated. American School Board Journal, 1981, 168, 25-27.

Rubin, L. J. The case for staff development. In Thomas J. Sergiovanni (ed.), Professional supervision for professional teachers. Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1975.

Sapone, C. V. Appraisal and evaluation systems: Perceptions of administrators, teachers. National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1981, 65, 25-30.

Soar, R. S. Problems in analyzing process-product relationships in studies of teacher effectiveness. Journal of Education, 1978, 160, 96-116.

Stinnett, T. M. & Huggett, A. J. Professional problems of teachers, (3rd ed.). New York: McMillan, 1968.

Stow, S. B. & Sweeney, J. Developing a teacher performance evaluation system. Educational Leadership, 1981, 38, 539-41.

The School Code of Illinois. State Board of Education, Illinois Office of Education. St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing Company, 1979.

Thomas, A. K. Determining priorities among competencies: Judgments of classroom teachers and supervisors. In R. W. Houston (ed.), Exploring competency based evaluation. Berkeley, CA: McCuthan Publishing Company, 1974.

Thompson, M. L. Persistent difficulties of teacher evaluation. Illinois School Research, 1981, 17(3), 1-8.

Vergason, G. A. & McAfee, J. R. Layman's guide to parents' rights under PL 94-142. Exceptional Parent, 1979, 9, i-iii.

Westling, D. L. Koorland, M., & Rose, T. Characteristics of superior and average special education teachers. Exceptional Child, 1981, 47, 357-63.

Winborne, C. R. Evaluation dilemma: Special education and the principal. National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1981, 65, 22-24.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
ILLINOIS OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Joseph M. Cronin
State Superintendent of Education

April 02, 1979

Ms. Deborah L. Hill
% Special Education Department
Pullium Hall
SIU
Carbondale, IL 62901

Dear Ms. Hill:

Per your request of February 20, 1979 and subsequent follow-up correspondence, find enclosed mailing labels for special education and joint agreement districts in the state of Illinois.

In response to Dr. Sabitino's question regarding the need for appropriate signatures on requests for data, I have two comments. First, the Illinois Office of Education responds to a substantial number of data requests each year from various individuals and organizations. Because we use tax payers dollars to provide this service at no cost to requesters, it is necessary to have established policy controlling the expenditure of these monies. The primary requisite is that public resources be utilized in legitimate ways. To this end, for instance, we do not expend resources to provide data to political organizations, sectarian organizations, or commercial firms for purposes not directly related to service or education.

In applying these policies to universities, IOE does not presume to have the expertise nor do we have the desire to judge the relevancy and merit of specialized research. Therefore, our policies are written to include the appropriate people in our decision-making process, i.e., deans of education colleges, graduate department chairmen, etc. By requiring the signatures of these people who have the knowledge and approval authority over the research, we justify our expenditure of public funds.

Secondly, concerning what constitutes an "appropriate signature", it depends on the structure of the organization and the "lingua franca" used therein. The use of the word "dean", "department chairman", department head", or

100 North First Street
Springfield, Illinois 62777
217/782-4321

188 West Randolph
Chicago, Illinois 60601
312/793-2220

State Office Building
601 North 18th
Mt. Vernon, Illinois 62864
618/242-1676

Post Office Box 625
DeKalb, Illinois 60115
815/753-0261

3 Henson Place
Champaign, Illinois 61820
217/333-8770

"administrator" is a matter of semantics. In light of the preceding paragraph, it is clear that Dr. Sabitino's signature meets our policy criterian.

I hope I have sufficiently explained the necessity for signatures. If you or Dr. Sabitino have any questions, please contact me. Good luck in your research. The Illinois Office of Education is pleased to serve you.

Sincerely,

D. Dennis Powell
Data Validity Supervisor
Data Management Administration

DDP:km

Illinois State Board of Education

100 North First Street
Springfield, Illinois 62777
217/782-4321

Edward Copeland, Chairman
Illinois State Board of Education

Donald G. Gill
State Superintendent of Education

April 27, 1982

Deborah Hill
c/o Dr. Howard Morgan
Special Education Department
Pullium Hall
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois 62901

Dear Deborah:

In response to your April 16 letter, I am enclosing one set of mailing labels for all special education districts and joint agreements in the State of Illinois.

If you should have any questions, or need further assistance, please call me at 217/782-4313.

Sincerely,

Kathy Markham
Data Management Administration

188 West Randolph
Chicago Illinois 60601
312/793-2220

State Office Building
601 North 18th
Mt. Vernon, Illinois 62864
618/242-1676

2600 North Brinton Avenue
Dixon, Illinois 61021
815/288-7861

200 South Fredrick Street
Rantoul, Illinois 61866
217/333-8770

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer

APPENDIX B

Teacher Evaluation Form	Discipline			Behavior Management				Classroom Management					Instructional				Relationships With Parents					Professional Development						Communication Between Sp. Ed. and Local District				Total Criteria Within Form
	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	
Total																																

APPENDIX C

Dear Special Education Administrator,

I am a graduate student at Southern Illinois University with the Special Education Department. My graduate studies are in the area of teacher evaluation and concerns the criteria used by individual schools and districts for evaluation of their teachers.

In order to complete my research activities, a wide sampling of evaluation criteria is necessary. The Center for Evaluation Development and Research is cooperating with the research.

I am asking you to send one copy of the evaluation form that your district most frequently uses in the evaluation of teachers. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

A stamped, self-addressed envelope is enclosed for you convenience.

Thank you,

Deborah Hill

Deborah Hill
c/o Special Education Department
Pullium Hall
SIU
Carbondale, IL 62901

APPENDIX D

PHI DELTA KAPPA

A PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION FRATERNITY DEDICATED TO THE PROMOTION AND IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLICLY SUPPORTED AND UNIVERSALLY AVAILABLE EDUCATION (FOUNDED 1906)

CENTER ON EVALUATION, DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

WILLIAM J. GEPHART, Director

CEDR

March 30, 1979

Deborah Hill
c/o Special Education Dept.
Pullion Hall
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois 62901

Dear Ms. Hill:

Thank you for your letter expressing interest in the document finder project. At present we have not identified anyone to fill the document finder role for your area of Illinois. Woudl you have any interest in participating in this project? I am enclosing a project description, newsletter, and a document finder application form.

If you do not think you can consider this right now, please contact the individual listed below. He is the document finder in the area closest to you.

Dr. D. Eugene Meyer
Gabel Hall, 162A
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois 60115

Thank you for your interest and persistence in regard to this project. From the description in your letter, it appears that you have identified a wealth of information in which the project would be very interested.

Sincerely,

Mary R Carroll rs

Mary R. Carroll
Postdoctoral Fellow

MRC.rkb
Enclosures.

Eighth Street & Union Avenue, Box 789, Bloomington, Indiana 47401 Telephone 812/339-1156

Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois 60115

Department of
Curriculum and Instruction

Faculty in Elementary and
Early Childhood Education

7-6-79

Deborah L. Hill
Route 1 Box 74A
Makanda, IL. 62958

Dear Deborah,

I have your letter concerning your study on teacher evaluation. We do not have at this time any materials. We are just in the process of selecting and hope to have reviews by February 1980.

It would be fine with me if you wish to state CEDR is cooperating with you in your study. Also, I would be happy to serve in the blind analysis process.

I have done research on teacher evaluation at the university level and at the moment I'm doing a study on Illinois Administrators, Teachers, and Support Personnel. I hope to finish the project by December.

For your information I will enclose evaluation forms which I have collected from the Northern Illinois school districts.

I hope this information is helpful.

Celebrate LIFE,

D Eugene Meyer

D. Eugene Meyer
Professor

Northern Illinois University is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer

VITA

Graduate School
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale

NAME Deborah Hill DATE OF BIRTH August 25, 1954

Home Address 1213 North Bridge
Carbondale, Illinois 62901

Universities Attended

Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois, B.S. in Special Education, 1972-1975

Areas of Certification

Behavior Disordered, Learning Disabled Educable Mentally Handicapped
Elementary Education K-9

Research Report Title

A CONTENT ANALYSIS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER FORMS

Advisor

Dr. Howard Morgan, Special Education Department

Publication

"Development of the Individualized Education Program," in Resource Guide for Vocational Personnel Serving Mental Health/ Developmentally Disabled Clients, July, 1980.